

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire - Instructions  
2022

Thanks for submitting a warrant article to Town Meeting. The Advisory Committee (the “AC”) assigns all articles to a subcommittee, which holds a public hearing that you should plan on attending. The subcommittee chair or a designee will work with you to set a mutually convenient date, within the confines of the time the subcommittee has available.

You do not need to make a formal presentation to the subcommittee, but it would be extremely helpful if you would complete the questionnaire below, answering only the questions that are relevant to your article. Please note that completing this questionnaire is discretionary. There is nothing to compel a sponsor under Massachusetts General Laws or the Town Bylaws for anything that is being requested.

Please enter your responses on this form<sup>1</sup> and email it at least three days in advance of the subcommittee hearing to the subcommittee chair and to [lpotscher@brooklinema.gov](mailto:lpotscher@brooklinema.gov). Providing your responses in advance will make the subcommittee hearing more efficient and quite possibly more satisfactory to all parties. (You may be asked for more detail at the hearing.)

After its hearing, the subcommittee will prepare a report for the AC, and you will be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee. The AC may decide to accept the subcommittee’s report without debate. In that case, the subcommittee’s report will be included in the Combined Reports, a document that is published in advance of Town Meeting and distributed to all Town Meeting Members. Alternatively, the AC may have a full discussion and debate, and then vote on a recommendation.

If that happens, you will be able to respond to questions and make a brief statement just before the full AC votes.

Note that the AC provides only recommendations to Town Meeting, and Town Meeting is not required to accept those recommendations. In addition, you will have an opportunity at Town Meeting to present your case for passing the warrant article.

We strongly recommended that you consult with Town Counsel or the Town Meeting Moderator to ensure that the article you submitted is in proper form, especially if it involves amending the Town’s General Bylaws or Zoning Bylaws. And if it involves Zoning, be sure to consult with the Community Planning & Development Department. Contact information for all parties is available on the Town’s website.

See pages 3-4 of the [Town Meeting Handbook](#), which explains how Town Meeting addresses warrant articles.

Thank you again for engaging in the civic life of the community.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a fillable PDF, so you don’t need Word or one of its alternatives, For tech support with the form, contact [msandman@brooklinema.gov](mailto:msandman@brooklinema.gov).

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire  
2022

Today's Date	April 4, 2022
Warrant Article #	18
Article Title	Bicycle Parking and Design Requirements
Petitioner(s)	Maria Morelli, Senior Planner Department of Planning and Community Development
Petitioner's email	mmorelli@brooklinema.gov

Not all of these questions apply to all warrant articles. Just answer the ones that do, SAVE the form, ideally with a new file name, and send it back to the chair of the subcommittee charged with vetting your article and to [lportscher@brooklinema.gov](mailto:lportscher@brooklinema.gov). Thank you.

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for "Not Applicable")
1	Provide the most recent version of the article exactly as it is intended to be voted on by Town Meeting. Please highlight any changes from the version that was originally submitted.	(Attach a separate document with the most recent version.)  No changes to WA submitted to TM
2	Goals & Benefits (Briefly, or send a separate file): a. What is the intended policy goal of the proposed Warrant Article? b. Why is this important for the Town? c. Is this something that the Town should do, especially if there are State or Federal resources dedicated to the issue? d. How does the policy goal and the proposed action solve a problem? Does it provide a new benefit, or extend some existing benefit? e. Could Town staff or a Town Board or Committee address the issue effectively without action by Town Meeting?	a. Zoning By-Law is very outdated (1 bike space for every 5 DU and does not realistically address resident demand and even the higher ratios that developers voluntarily provide in many multifamily projects. A 1.1 ratio for multifamily uses with modest waivers for adaptive reuse projects will promote inexpensive mode of bike transit in effort to reduce emissions.  b. Aligns with sustainability, transportation, and housing policies  c. The place for this policy is local zoning.  d. See A.  e. No
3	Does the petitioner, now or in the future, have an equity interest or realize a direct or indirect financial benefit from positive action by Town Meeting? If so, what are those interests or benefits? Please disclose any potential conflict of interest.	No

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire  
Fall 2021

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for “Not Applicable”)
4	General questions: a. Why is the proposed solution workable and effective? b. Is there a financial benefit from the proposed solution? c. Who will benefit and who might not benefit from the proposed action? d. What are the perceived pros and cons, both in the short and long term? e. What research on the topic supports or does not support the proposed article? f. What alternatives to the proposed action were considered?	<p>a. By providing protected and secure long-term bike parking areas in multifamily uses, residents will be encouraged to use bike transit as an affordable transit option. A ratio of 1.1 space per dwelling unit is reasonable and effective.</p> <p>b. Attractive amenity for developer to provide; encourages less expensive mode of transit.</p> <p>c. See B.</p> <p>d. No, the by-law would be keeping up with contemporary practices in permitted projects and as well as policy nationwide.</p> <p>e. Staff researched ordinances in North America and UK and consulted best practices set forth by APBP.org (Association of Bicycle and Pedestrian Professionals)</p>
5	Consider the impact on town infrastructure (parking, roadways, parks, etc.); residents; the environment; employers; etc. Are there potential adverse effects from positive action on the article by Town Meeting?	By-law addresses private parcels and would not adversely impact infrastructure. With more parking on private parcels, residents will be less inclined to park bikes on street poles in public way, etc.
6	Consider town priorities and allocation of funding. What amount of funding might be required to start and maintain the proposed action? What is the source of those funds? How does the proposed article fit within the operating and/or capital budgets?	NA
7	How does the proposed article and implementation impact the Town administration and staff priorities? Will a department either need to divert staff from an existing program, subcontract the work or add staff?	NA
8	Who will be responsible for implementing the action that a favorable vote will require? Has the petitioner consulted with those participants?	Building Commissioner would enforce. DPCD worked in partnership with Building Dept in drafting Article.
9	Community Outreach: a. What steps has the petitioner taken to assure that interested parties were notified and provided an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the proposed article? b. Are there any Town Boards or Committees that might be consulted? c. If another board or committee has considered the action of the proposed article, please include a summary of the discussion and outcome.	<p>Staff acknowledges the excellent work of residents Anthony Ishak and David Kroop in asking Staff to update By-Law. Mr. Ishak and Mr. Kroop engaged extensively with the bike community in Brookline to identify needs and to vet the scope of the Article. Staff appreciates their support and hard work.</p> <p>Staff also communicated with Transportation Administrator and Public Works Commissioner as this Department staffs the Transportation Board.</p>
10	Prior Articles: a. Do you know whether Town Meeting previously considered any Warrant Articles that address the same or similar topic? If so, do you know what the	<p>None that I am aware of</p> <p>(Continue on next page)</p>

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire  
Fall 2021

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for “Not Applicable”)
	outcome was? b. How does the proposed article differ from ones that were previously considered? c. Is there new information or are there new circumstances to support raising an issue that was previously considered by Town Meeting?	
11	Anything else you would like the subcommittee to know?	NA